## REMARKS

Claims 2, 14 and 24 are amended to more clearly define the invention.

Support for the amendment is found in the existing claims and in the Application description in connection with Figure 1.

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1-10 and 12-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0028364 – Fredell et al. These claims, as amended, are deemed to be patentable for the reasons given below.

Claim 1 recites a "system enabling a user of an application object, comprising an executable portion of an executable application, to access documents external to said application" comprising "a map associating a set of access links with an application object identifier; and an organization identifier identifying an organization, said set of access links supporting access to documents external to said application; a link processor for initiating provision of data, the data representing a set of access links, to a user in response to a received organization identifier and a received application object identifier; and a command processor for initiating access to an external document using a link in said set of access links in response to user command". These features are not shown (or suggested) in Fredell.

The system of claim 1 "provides secure and seamless integration between a laboratory information system and user-specific external documentation, third party software applications, and/or internet sites. Such a system enables administrators of model software based applications to add and manage access links to external sources, thereby permitting users of such applications to access third party files and applications directly from the application" (Application page 3 line 21 to page 4 line 2). The system does this by providing "data representing a set of access links, to a user in response to a received organization identifier and a received application object identifier". The "set of access links" supports "access to documents external to said application" and access is enabled using "a map associating a set of access links with an application object identifier; and an organization identifier identifying an organization". An access link supports communication and data access and comprises a URL, an IP address, a storage file directory address, a storage file address, a communication port address, a server address or an address for use in

locating a document (see claim 6). Therefore the system provides a "set of access links" enabling an "application object, comprising an executable portion of an executable application" to have "access to documents external to" an "application". In contrast, Fredell does NOT teach providing a "set of access links" enabling "access to documents external to" an "application" but rather teaches providing centrally accessible documents (the documents themselves **not** links to the documents).

Specifically, the Fredell system "includes a database located at a secure data storage facility and a computer program operable at such facility for enabling reception, storage and transmission of securely encrypted documents with access to the documents being enabled through a global computer network using conventional network browser software having encryption capability" (para. 0009). Consequently, Fredell teaches, acquiring, collating and storing in a centralized location a set of documents (not a "set of access links"). It is precisely the burden of these steps that the claimed arrangement seeks to avoid by providing a "set of access links" enabling an "application object" to have "access to documents external to" an "application" in combination with use of "a map associating a set of access links with an application object identifier; and an organization identifier identifying an organization". The Application on page 2 lines 25-27 specifically recognizes the Fredell type system ("Some such systems link user-generated documentation to a software application by using a documentation repository for storing user generated documentation"). The Application further indicates that "these systems do not enable system users to define custom menu options that link to user-specific documents" and specifically "they do not permit the user of a laboratory information system to access third party files and applications directly from the laboratory system", for example (Application page 3 lines 3-7).

Contrary to the Rejection statements on page 2, Fredell in para. 0040 merely describes a process involved in providing centrally accessible documents ("Administrator 22 or project participant 18 scans and verifies each document, and enters basic indexing information about each respective document into the system, such as document title, document folder, project identifier and/or other comments, etc"). Thereby Fredell teaches a fundamentally different system to that of the claimed arrangement and one that is specifically distinguished as being burdened by problems addressed by the claimed arrangement. Fredell does NOT teach providing a "set of access links" enabling an "application object" to have "access to documents external to" an "application" in combination with use of "a map associating a set of access links with an application object identifier; and an organization identifier identifying

an organization". Fredell in para, 0088 mentions hyperlinks but only in the context of Figure 4 for provision of a link to a user enabling access to the central repository of documents, for example ("web page 100 including a plurality of clickable icons, e.g., icons 101-106 representative of functionality provided by the system. Web page 100 further includes a user navigator window 108 including a plurality of clickable hyperlinks 110. Icon 101 provides access to an on-line "Document Vault" that allows for providing immediate access to the latest draft of documentation, memoranda, etc"). Fredell nowhere shows, suggests or recognizes the advantages of providing a "set of access links" enabling an "application object" to have "access to documents external to" an "application" in combination with use of "a map associating a set of access links with an application object identifier; and an organization identifier identifying an organization". The hyperlinks of Figure 4 are not provided "to a user in response to a received organization identifier and a received application object identifier" using "a map associating a set of access links with an application object identifier; and an organization identifier identifying an organization". Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of amended claim 1 under 35 USC 102(e) is respectfully requested.

Amended dependent claim 2 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 2 is also considered to be patentable because Fredell does not show (or suggest) the "said set of access links supports access to documents from a plurality of different sources external to said application, said map associates said set of access links with a role identifier, the role identifier identifying a particular user performable role; and said link processor automatically initiates provision of data representing a role specific set of access links to a user in response to a received role identifier". Fredell mentions user role in para. 0089, 0104 but does not discuss or suggest limiting user access to a role specific set of access links to a user in response to a received role identifier". Rather, Fredell in para. 0089 merely mentions a "user or participant directory that conveniently lists basic user demographic information, their role in the project, and their rights to access components of the system". Even assuming that a user right to access components in the Fredell system is role specific, a system component may be a hardware device and there is no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure that it is or suggests a "set of access links".

Dependent claim 3 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 3 is also considered to be patentable because Fredell does not show (or suggest) "said map associates a plurality of sets of access links with (a) a **plurality** of **application object identifiers**, the object identifiers identifying a

corresponding plurality of application objects, **and** (b) a **plurality of organization identifiers**, the organization identifiers identifying a corresponding plurality of organizations; and said link processor selects a set of access links from said plurality of sets of access links in response to a received organization identifier and a received application object identifier, the link processor initiating provision of data representing said selected set of access links to a user". Contrary to the Rejection statement on page 3, Fredell in para. 0010 and 0043 relied on does not show or suggest a "map" that "associates a plurality of sets of access links with (a) a plurality of application object identifiers, the object identifiers identifying a corresponding plurality of application objects, and (b) a plurality of organization identifiers, the organization identifiers". As previously explained in connection with claim 1, Fredell teaches a system providing centrally accessible documents NOT a set of access links and certainly fails to show or suggest such a feature combination.

Dependent claim 4 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claims 1 and 3 and for reasons given in connection with claims 1 and 2. Claim 4 is also considered to be patentable because Fredell does not show (or suggest) the feature combination in which "said map associates said plurality of sets of access links with a **plurality** of **role identifiers** identifying a corresponding plurality of roles performed by **a** user; and said link processor selects a set of access links from said plurality of sets of access links in response to a received role identifier, the link processor initiating provision of data representing said selected set of access links to a user".

Dependent claim 5 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1.

Dependent claim 6 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 6 is also considered to be patentable because Fredell does not show (or suggest) the feature combination in which "an access link comprises at least one of (i) a universal resource locator, (ii) an internet protocol address, (iii) a storage file directory address, (iv) a storage file address, (v) a communication port address, (vi) a server address and (vii) an address for use in locating a document; and a document comprises at least one of (a) a web page, (b) an HTML file, (c) a Word document, (d) an SGML document, (e) an XML document, (f) a multimedia file, (g) an Excel file, (h) a Portable Document Format file, (i) an executable file, (j) a text file and (k) an accessible file". Contrary to the Rejection statement on page 3, Fredell in para. 0040 and 0062-0063 relied on does not show or

suggest providing a "set of access links" enabling an "application object" to have "access to documents external to" an "application" in which "an access link comprises at least one of (i) a universal resource locator, (ii) an internet protocol address, (iii) a storage file directory address, (iv) a storage file address, (v) a communication port address, (vi) a server address and (vii) an address for use in locating a document". There is no such disclosure or suggestion in Fredell.

Dependent claim 7 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 7 is also considered to be patentable because Fredell does not show (or suggest) the feature combination in which "said link processor initiates provision of data representing a menu window for displaying said set of access links to a user". Contrary to the Rejection statement on page 4, Fredell in Figure 4 relied on does not show or suggest a "menu window for displaying" a "set of access links" enabling an "application object" to have "access to documents external to" an "application". Rather Figure 4 shows (see para, 0088) hyperlinks for provision of a link to a user enabling access to the central repository of documents, for example ("web page 100 including a plurality of clickable icons, e.g., icons 101-106 representative of functionality provided by the system. Web page 100 further includes a user navigator window 108 including a plurality of clickable hyperlinks 110. Icon 101 provides access to an on-line "Document Vault" that allows for providing immediate access to the latest draft of documentation, memoranda, etc"). Fredell nowhere shows, suggests or recognizes the advantages of providing a "set of access links" enabling an "application object" to have "access to documents external to" an "application" in combination with use of "a map associating a set of access links with an application object identifier; and an organization identifier identifying an organization". The hyperlinks of Figure 4 are not provided "to a user in response to a received organization identifier and a received application object identifier" using "a map associating a set of access links with an application object identifier; and an organization identifier identifying an organization".

Dependent claim 8 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claims 1 and 7. Claim 8 is also considered to be patentable because Fredell does not show or suggest the feature combination of claim 8 in which "said link processor determines an order of display of said access links in said menu window based on at least one of (a) a determined relative importance of individual access links of said set of access links to a role performable by a user, (b) a determined relative importance of access links in said set of access links, (c) alphabetical order, (d) a determined relative importance of access links of said set of

access links to an organization and (e) another determined logical order". Contrary to the Rejection statement on page 4, Fredell in para. 0010 relied on does not show or suggest the feature combination involving a "link processor" that "determines an order of display" of a set of "access links in said menu window". Fredell does not contemplate order of access links at all.

Dependent claim 9 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 9 is also considered to be patentable because Fredell does not show (or suggest) the feature combination in which "said command processor initiates access to said external document using a link in said set of access links, the access to the external document being initiated from within said executable application object". Fredell in para. 0010 relied on merely mentions providing access to centralized documents (the "document vault") and not using a set of access links provided "to a user in response to a received organization identifier and a received application object identifier" using "a map associating a set of access links with an application object identifier; and an organization identifier identifying an organization".

Dependent claim 10 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claims 1 and 9. Claim 10 is also considered to be patentable because Fredell does not show (or suggest) the feature combination in which "said command processor initiates access to said external document using a link in said set of access links concurrently with operation of said executable application object". Fredell in para. 0010 relied on merely mentions providing access to centralized documents ("document vault") and not using a set of access links provided "to a user in response to a received organization identifier and a received application object identifier" using "a map associating a set of access links with an application object identifier; and an organization identifier identifying an organization".

Dependent claim 12 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 12 is also considered to be patentable because Fredell does not show (or suggest) the feature combination in which "an access link supports access to a second and different executable application; and said command processor initiates access to said second application". Fredell in para. 0010 relied on merely mentions providing access to centralized documents ("document vault") and not using a set of access links provided "to a user in response to a received organization identifier and a received application object identifier" using "a map associating a set

of access links with an application object identifier; and an organization identifier identifying an organization".

Dependent claim 13 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 13 is also considered to be patentable because Fredell does not show (or suggest) the feature combination in which "said organization identifier comprises a location identifier". Fredell in para. 0009 relied on nowhere suggests using a set of access links provided "to a user in response to a received "location identifier".

Independent claim 14 recites a "system enabling a user of an application object, comprising an executable portion of an executable application, to access documents external to said application" comprising "a map associating a set of access links with (a) an application object identifier and (b) a role identifier identifying a particular user performable role, said set of access links supporting access by an application to documents external to said application; a link processor for initiating providing data representing a set of access links to a user in response to a received role identifier and a received application object identifier; and a command processor for initiating access to an external document using a link in said set of access links in response to user command". These features are not shown or suggested in Fredell in para. 0040, 0043, 0061-0064 or elsewhere for reasons given in connection with claims 1 and 2.

Specifically, Fredell nowhere shows, suggests or recognizes the advantages of providing a "set of access links" enabling an "application object" to have "access to documents external to" an "application" in combination with use of "a map associating a set of access links" with an "application object identifier" and "a role identifier identifying a particular user performable role". Further Fredell fails to suggest a "link processor for initiating providing data representing a set of access links to a user in response to a received role identifier and a received application object identifier". The hyperlinks of Figure 4 are not provided "in response to a received **role** identifier **and** a received **application object** identifier". Also Fredell does not contemplate providing a role specific set of access links to a user in response to a received "role identifier". Fredell mentions user role in para. 0089, 0104 but does not discuss or suggest limiting user access to a role specific set of access links to a user in response to a received role identifier". Rather, Fredell in para. 0089 merely mentions a "user or participant directory that conveniently lists basic user demographic information, their role in the project, and their rights to access

components of the system". Even assuming that a user right to access components in the Fredell system is role specific, a system component may be a hardware device and there is no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure that it is or suggests a "set of access links".

Independent claim 15 recites a "system enabling a user of an application object, comprising an executable portion of an executable application, to access documents external to said application" comprising "an authorization processor for determining whether a user is authorized to access a particular application object of a plurality of objects within an application in response to a received user identification information and a received application object identifier; a map associating a plurality of sets of access links with a plurality of application object identifiers identifying a corresponding plurality of application objects, said access links supporting access to external documents; and a link processor for employing, in response to successful user authorization, said map in selecting a set of access links from said plurality of sets in response to said received application object identifier and for initiating providing data representing said selected set of access links to a user". These features are not shown or suggested in Fredell in para. 0011, 0040, 0043, 0062-0063 or elsewhere for reasons previously given and the following reasons.

Fredell nowhere shows, suggests or recognizes the advantages of providing "a map associating a plurality of sets of access links" supporting access to external documents "with a plurality of application object identifiers identifying a corresponding plurality of application objects" in combination with use of a "link processor for employing" the "map" in "selecting a set of access links from said plurality of sets in response to said received application object identifier and for initiating providing data representing said selected set of access links to a user". Fredell in para. 0011 and 0043 relied on does not show or suggest "selecting a **set of access li**nks from said **plurality** of **sets** in response to said received **application object identifier** and for initiating providing data representing said selected set of access links to a user". Fredell nowhere suggests such features and in para. 0011, 0043, 0062-0063, Figure 4 merely discusses aspects of the Fredell centralized document storage system and does not show or suggest such features.

Fredell teaches a fundamentally different system to that of the claimed arrangement and one that is specifically distinguished as being burdened by problems addressed by the claimed arrangement. Fredell does NOT teach "selecting a set of

access links from said plurality of sets in response to said received application object identifier and for initiating providing data representing said selected set of access links to a user". Fredell in para, 0088 mentions hyperlinks but only in the context of Figure 4 for provision of a link to a user enabling access to the central repository of documents, for example ("web page 100 including a plurality of clickable icons, e.g., icons 101-106 representative of functionality provided by the system. Web page 100 further includes a user navigator window 108 including a plurality of clickable hyperlinks 110. Icon 101 provides access to an on-line "Document Vault" that allows for providing immediate access to the latest draft of documentation, memoranda, etc"). Fredell nowhere shows, suggests or recognizes the advantages of "selecting a set of access links from said plurality of sets in response to said received application object identifier and for initiating providing data representing said selected set of access links to a user". The hyperlinks of Figure 4 are not selected from a "plurality of sets" and are not selected "in response" to a "received application object identifier".

Dependent claim 16 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 15 for reasons given in connection with claims 1, 11 and 15.

Dependent claim 17 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claims 15 and 16 for reasons given in connection with claims 1, 2, 11 and 15.

Dependent claim 18 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 15 for reasons given in connection with claims 1, 9 and 15.

Dependent claim 19 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 15. Claim 19 is also considered to be patentable because Fredell does not show (or suggest) the feature combination in which "said plurality of sets of access links include prioritized sets of access links; and said link processor selects a single set of access links from said plurality of sets based on set priority". Fredell in para. 0010, 0092 relied on merely discusses project tasks which may be linkable to the database (including the centralized document vault) to provide access to the centralized documents. Fredell does NOT show or suggest "selecting a set of access links" "based on set priority" from "said plurality of sets in response to said received application object identifier and for initiating providing data representing said selected set of access links to a user".

Dependent claim 20 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 15. Claim 20 is also considered to be patentable because Fredell does not show (or suggest) the feature combination in which "said authorization processor determines whether a user is authorized to access an external document in response to received user identification documentation, the system further comprising a command processor for inhibiting access to an external document using a link in said set of selected access links in response to a denial of user authorization". Fredell in para. 0054-0056 and 0063-0064 relied on does NOT show or suggest "**inhibiting** access to an external document using a link in said **set of selected access links** in response to a **denial** of user authorization".

Dependent claim 21 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 15. Claim 21 is also considered to be patentable because Fredell does not show (or suggest) the feature combination in which "said authorization processor determines whether a user is authorized to access an external document using a link in said selected set of access links in response to received user identification information; and said link processor inhibits providing data representing an access link to a user in response to a denial of user authorization to access said external document generated by said authorization processor". Fredell in para. 0064 relied on does NOT show or suggest such a feature combination.

Dependent claim 22 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 15. Claim 22 is also considered to be patentable because Fredell does not show (or suggest) the feature combination in which "said authorization processor maintains an audit trail identifying access to external documents by storing records identifying at least one of (a) a document accessed, (b) a time and date of access, (c) an entity accessing a document and (d) a source of an access request". Fredell in para. 0040, 0043, 0061-0064 relied on does NOT show or suggest such features.

Independent method claim 23 mirrors independent apparatus claim 1 and is considered to be patentable for similar reasons to claim 1.

Independent method claim 24 mirrors independent apparatus claim 14 and is considered to be patentable for similar reasons to claim 14.

Independent method claim 25 mirrors independent apparatus claim 15 and is considered to be patentable for similar reasons to claim 15.

*II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)*

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0028364 – Fredell et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0049610 – Hazumi. This claim is deemed to be patentable for the reasons given below.

Dependent claim 11 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 11 is also considered to be patentable because Fredell does not show (or suggest) the feature combination in which "said application comprises a **laboratory information system** and said external document comprises information concerning at least one of (a) test procedures, (b) chemistry procedures, (c) microbiology procedures, (d) hematology procedures (e) phlebotomy procedures, (f) instrument support, (g) an electronic patient medical record, (h) orders to perform patient procedures, (i) laboratory test results and (j) a patient visit".

The Rejection recognizes on page 10 that Fredell does not show or suggest such features but erroneously states that such features are obvious in view of Hazumi. Contrary to the Rejection statement Fredell with Hazumi fails to show or suggest providing a "set of access links" enabling a "**laboratory information system**" "object" to have "access to documents external to" an "application" in combination with use of "a map associating a set of access links with" a "**laboratory information system**" object identifier; and an organization identifier identifying an organization". Neither Hazumi nor Fredell even mention a "laboratory information system" or make any suggestion of applying the claimed features in a laboratory information system. Neither Hazumi nor Fredell, alone or together, provide any reason, problem recognition or other motivation for incorporating the claimed arrangement into a laboratory information system.

Consequently withdrawal of the Rejection of claims 1-25 is respectfully requested.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections, it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at the phone number below,

so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,

Alexander J. Burke
Reg. No. 40,425

Date

Siemens Corporation
Customer No. 28524

Tel 732 321 3023
Fax 732 321 3030